

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated November 18, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire February 18, 2005. In the present Amendment, Claim 24 is added. Claims 9-15 and 17-24 are now pending.

Applicants note with appreciation the teleconference held with the Examiner on February 9, 2005. During that teleconference, the Examiner suggested that new Claim 24 include the explicit language describing outgoing data packets from the hard drive, as illustrated in Figure 3 of the present application, and to use the term "dual-port memory" to comport with terminology used in the specification to describe the multi-port memory shown as dual-port memory 304 in Figure 3. Applicants have made the suggested changes, and appreciate the Examiner's advice.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

In the present Office Action, Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Narad* (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,955 – "*Narad*"). Furthermore, Claims 10-15, 17-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Narad* in view of *Yang et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,446 – "*Yang*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With regards to exemplary Claim 9, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a system that "bypasses the system bus for the volatile system memory and directly communicates with the non-volatile memory to transfer the packet from the non-system memory in the network adapter to the system's non-volatile memory." With reference to Figure 3 of *Narad*, only one PCI interface 280 is taught. Therefore, any access to the system non-volatile memory needs to transit through the PCI bus. Similarly, as seen in Figure 2 of *Yang*, all traffic is via the PCI bus 102. There is no teaching or suggestion in either *Narad* or *Yang* that the PCI expansion bus is configured in any way except for the standard manner for it or any other type of expansion bus, in which it is directly connected (via a bus bridge known to those skilled in the art) to the system (a.k.a. "front side") bus.

**NEW CLAIM 24**

Newly added Claim 24 reflects a data pathway discussed with the Examiner during the February 10, 2005 teleconference. As supported in the present specification on page 10, lines 1-10, outbound data packets from the SCSI interfaced hard drive pass to the LAN without touching the system bus. None of the cited prior art teaches or suggests this feature, and particularly as so claimed such that the data passes "from the hard disk to the SCSI bus to the SCSI logic unit to the dual-port memory to the dual-port memory to the LAN logic unit to the LAN."

CONCLUSION

As the prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the presently claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested.

The present amendment adds one excess independent claim. Therefore, please charge **IBM DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 09-0457** in the amount of **\$200.00** to cover the fee for excess claim. In addition, please charge any additional fees necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 09-0457**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
Registration No. 44,545  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 201720  
Austin, Texas 78720-1720  
(512) 343-6116  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS